

APR 30 1987

In the Matter of the Arbitration  
of a Dispute Between

MONTELLO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

and

MONTELLO SCHOOL DISTRICT

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

Stanley H. Michelstetter II  
Arbitrator

Appearances:

David R. Friedman, Attorney at Law, appearing on behalf of  
the Employer.

Jermitt Krage, UniServ Director, appearing on behalf of the  
Association.

ARBITRATION AWARD

Montello Education Association, herein referred to as the  
"Association", and Montello School District, herein referred to  
as the "Employer", having selected the Undersigned as Arbitrator,  
pursuant to a voluntary impasse procedure created pursuant to  
Section 111.70(4)(cm), Wis. Stats. 1/; and the Undersigned having  
conducted mediation December 1, 1986, and having conducted  
hearing, both in Montello, Wisconsin, on December 15, 1986; the  
parties having filed briefs and reply briefs the last of which  
was received February 19, 1986. 2/

ISSUES

The instant dispute involves the terms to be included in the  
parties' 1986-87 collective bargaining agreement. The parties'  
final offers are incorporated by reference. The Employer's pro-  
posed salary schedule is attached hereto and marked Appendix A.  
The Association's proposed schedule is attached hereto and  
marked Appendix B. The current salary schedule is attached  
hereto and marked Appendix C. The following is a summary of the  
differences between the parties:

**SALARY SCHEDULE:** The Employer costs its proposal as \$1,802 per  
returning teacher and 8.63% salary only, \$2,227 and 8.36% total  
package. It costs the Association's offer as \$2,030 and 9.73%  
salary only and \$2,501 and 9.39% total package. The  
Association agrees with the Employer's costing of all, but the

1/ Section 111.70, Wis. Stats., has since been amended, and the  
parties have adopted those amendments for this dispute.

2/

The impasse resolution procedure involved herein was created  
pursuant to the consent award in Montello School District  
(23753-A) (Michelstetter) 9/86.

Employer's percentage figure of its total package. Both parties propose to maintain the same basic salary schedule structure, but disagree as to how the money will be allocated within the salary structure and the length of the schedule which will appear in the contract. Both parties propose to keep the unlimited superaddition which grants all employees an increment plus any increase in base.

EXTRA CURRICULAR: The Employer proposes to add two extra-curricular positions (both titled Varsity Club Advisor) and to provide an extra curricular schedule for their positions. Otherwise, it proposes no change in the current coaching and extra curricular schedules. The Association has not proposed the creation of any new positions, but does propose that all head coaches starting salaries will be increased by \$50 and all Assistant, Freshmen and Junior High Coaches starting salaries will be increased by \$25.00 with increments in those positions remaining unchanged and it proposes that all extra-curricular starting salaries be increased by \$25 and that all increments remain unchanged.

RETROACTIVITY: both parties propose that the agreement be fully retroactive, but the Association requires that backpay be paid within thirty days of the date of this award.

#### POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Association relies primarily upon the comparison criterion. It agrees with the Employer that the primary comparison group is the Dual County Athletic Conference, Cambria-Friesland, Fall River, Green Lake, Montello, Pardeeville, Poynette, Princeton, Randolph, Rio and Westfield. The Association takes the view that the Arbitrator should rely upon comparison of dollars per returning teacher, percentage increase of both salary and total packages for comparison, rather than benchmark analysis because; 1. the parties have traditionally bargained dollars per returning teacher and percentage increases rather than benchmark increases. 2. four of the ten comparable districts, Cambria-Friesland, Montello, Pardeeville and Randolph do not have traditional salary schedules in that each has longevity ("super additions" based upon length of service) and step 16 has traditionally here been used as the "maximums". The Association views its total package (both dollars and percentage) as closer to the average of the Dual County Athletic Conference than the Employer's. While it concedes that the Employer's offer is closer to the average salary-only increase by percentage, it finds its offer is closer on a dollar per returning teacher basis. In any event, it notes that this particular dispute arises as part of a two year agreement and that when comparisons of increases are made over a two year basis (1985-7) its offer is clearly supported. ( It should be noted the parties have a different figure for what average dollar per returning teacher salary only was for the conference.) It also notes that neither offer of either party would significantly alter rank, however,

the Association's position would provide better increases in the masters column where there exists a major disparity with other districts.

The Association believes that it is in the best interests of the public to maintain competitive salaries with comparable districts, even though increases in other forms of employment in both the private and public sectors might not be as high, because; 1. teaching is an underpaid profession, and 2. competitive salaries are needed to retain teachers here. It argues that the legislature specifically set aside additional money to raise teacher salaries. It argues that, therefore, no weight should be given to non teacher salary comparisons. It admits that Montello has the highest poverty level of comparable school districts but argues that is all the more reason to pay higher wages to unit employees to encourage the retention of qualified teachers to help end the poverty cycle. The Association also argues that it is not in the interest of the public to maintain a salary schedule in which teachers with a masters degree have the lowest career earnings of any comparable district.

It also argues that the employer has the ability to pay. It notes the Employer's fund balance increased \$363,315 to \$1,195,480 as of July 1, 1986. This balance is 50% of the Employer's 85-6 year total expenditure. It also notes that the Employer earns \$35,270 in interest alone. It relies heavily on the fact that the district received a \$229,686 increase in federal and state aid for 1985-6 over the previous year, which is expected to increase by \$95,543 for the 1986-7 year. Thus, it argues that since the district's expenditures increased less than its revenues, the Employer cannot seriously rely on local economic conditions as a basis of less than comparable settlement. It argues that, in any event, the effort of Montello to support its schools is already lower than in comparable school districts. The Association denies that the local economy is in trouble. It notes that there has been a significant growth in local economic improvements in commercial and residential property which factor suggests a strong economy.

The Employer relies heavily upon the comparison critereon. It agrees with the Association that the appropriate comparison group is the Dual County Athletic Conference. Unlike the Association, the Employer relies soley upon those districts which are settled for 1986-7 for 1986-7 comparisons. The Employer argues that if the Arbitrator is going to use bench mark analysis, he will have to decide how to compare the Montello schedule of unlimited length with other area schedules at maximum levels. The Employer relies upon its interpretation of bargaining history for the proposition that although every teacher receives the base increase plus increment (super addition), the salary schedule technically ends at step 25, while the Association's technically ends at step 22. With respect to 1985-6, the Employer compares its schedule with that of the other comparable districts at the

BA and MA minimum and maximums and at schedule maximum.<sup>3/</sup> On the basis of its 25-22 step comparison, it concludes that the existing schedule compares favorably to average at the BA minimum and maximum, MA and Schedule maximum. Again, based upon its comparison at step 25-22, it takes the position that its offer compares more favorably to the average of the settled districts at the BA and MA minimums and maximums and schedule maximum, with respect to both dollar and percentage increase at these benchmarks. The Employer also argues on the basis of dollars per returning teacher and percentage increase both with respect to salary increase and total package. It argues that its proposal is well within the settlement range with respect to these factors. The Employer takes the position that its offer is closer to changes in the consumer price index than the Association's. While the Employer concedes that it has the economic ability to meet the Association's offer, it believes that its taxpayers are paying more than their fair share of taxes and that Montello is more economically depressed than other areas. The Employer also notes that teachers here work fewer contract days than in comparable districts and that its offer is more consistent with the parties' bargaining history than the Association's.

### DISCUSSION

This dispute occurs under a voluntary impasse procedure. The procedure requires that I select the final offer of one party or the other without modification. The parties have adopted as the standards for the resolution of this dispute, the standards as found in Section 111.70(4)(cm), Wis. Stats. as amended. These standards are:

"7. Factors considered. In making any decision under the arbitration procedures authorized by this paragraph, the arbitrator shall give weight to the following factors:

- a. The lawful authority of the municipal employer.
- b. Stipulations of the parties.
- c. The interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet the costs of any proposed settlement.
- d. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services

3/

The Employer argues that schedule maximums are not capable of calculation in Cambria, Pardeeville and Randolph in that all allow additional pay for any number of credits earned. It relies upon Randolph School District (22342-A) 8/85, @p. 7 for the proposition that these districts should be disregarded when comparing maximums.

e. Comparison of the wages, hour and conditions of employment of the municipal employes involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employes generally in public employment in the same community and in comparable communities.

f. Comparison of the wages hour and conditions of employment of the municipal employes involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hour and conditions of employment of other employes in private employment in the same community and in comparable communities.

g. The average consumer prices for goods and services, commonly known as the cost-of-living.

h. The overall compensation presently received by the municipal employes, including direct wage compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance and pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received.

i. Changes in any of the foregoing circumstances during the pendency of the arbitration proceedings.

j. Such other factors, not confined to the foregoing, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours and conditions of employment through voluntary collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration or otherwise between the parties, in the public service or in private employment."

While the parties have specified the standards to be applied, they have left the weight to be given any standard or any issue to the arbitrator.

#### Comparisons

The parties have agreed to the primary comparison group, the Dual Athletic Conference consisting of Cambria-Friesland, Fall River, Green Lake, Pardeeville, Poynette, Princeton, Randolph, Rio, Westfield, and Montello. The following is a wage rate comparison for this group for the 1985-6 school year, the last full year for which comparisons are available. I should note that Montello has a salary schedule of unlimited duration with respect to experience. No other district does this. I have made comparisons to all schedules and have used step 16 and 25 both for Montello when comparing with the comparable districts. A number of experienced teachers here are at, or soon to be at, the 16 level. No teacher has yet reached the 25 level and none will in the foreseeable future. The use of these two benchmarks then represent the current level of earnings of unit employees and the potential salary rate for senior teachers, respectively. I also note that some comparable districts do not have limits on the amount of additional pay a teacher may receive for obtaining additional academic credits. Since there are no teachers at the

salary schedule maximum in Montello or likely to reach that level, I have not made a comparison of schedule maximums.

1985-6 SALARY SCHEDULE COMPARISON, DUAL COUNTY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

District	BA	BA+7	MA	MA+10
Camb.	15,700.	18,850.	18,200.	23,825.
Fall R.	15,300.	18,300.	17,800.	22,300.
Gr. Lke.	15,750.	19,373.	18,585.	24,334.
Pard.	15,800.	19,952.	18,644.	25,691.
Poyn.	15,250.	18,682.	17,383.	22,873.
Prince.	15,525.	18,525.	18,025.	22,525.
Rand.	15,600.	18,200.	17,400.	22,775.
Rio	15,350.	19,034.	16,550.	22,508.
West.	15,400.	18,400.	18,500.	23,000.
av w/o	15,519.	18,813.	17,899.	23,315.

Mont.	16,212.	19,212.	17,612.	22,062.
diff.	693.	399.	-287.	-1,253.

District	BA Max	MA Max
Camb.	20,950.	25,700.
Fall R.	19,300.	24,300.
Gr. Lke.	20,081.	25,751.
Pard.	22,499.	26,549.
Poyn.	20,970.	24,703.
Prince.	21,025.	25,052.
Rand.	21,000.	25,475.
Rio	22,104.	23,832.
West.	21,700.	26,300.
av w/oM	21,070.	25,296.

Mont.16	22,312.	24,512.
diff.	1,242.	-784.
Mont.25	25,012.	27,662.
diff	3,942.	2,366.

There are 49.87 full time equivalent teachers in the unit. Of these all but 9.61 are in the BA ranges. (However, there are eight other teachers who are early in their career and are close to entering the MA ranges.) 18 teachers are above step 11 and those above twelve are mostly between step 14 and 17.

Based upon the current distribution, unit employees are well paid in comparison comparable units, but, although few unit employees are immediately in those ranges, teachers obtaining a MA degree with significant experience are substantially underpaid by comparison to comparable units.

Both parties offered comparison on the basis of total package to comparable settlements as reported to the WASB by area employers for the five districts which have settled for 1986-7. Those districts are Cambria, Fall River, Poynette, Randolph and Rio. Relying totally upon the figures supplied by the Employer in this case, the total package comparisons favor the Association as follows.

1986-7 TOTAL PACKAGE INCREASE COMPARISONS

	Dollars/Teacher	Per Cent
Cambria	2,652.	9.72
Fall River	2,451.	8.16
Poynette	2,215.	7.55
Randolph	2,706.	10.18
Rio	2,360.	9.12
average	2,477.	8.95
Montello E.	2,227.	8.36
diff	-250.00	-.59
A.	2,501.	9.39
diff	24.00	.44

Based upon these methods of comparison the offer of the Association is closer to comparable. It should be noted that the salary only increase offered by the Employer is slightly closer than the Association's, but on a two year basis it would appear that the Association's is much closer.

Finally, it should be noted that the offer of the Association tends to allocate the increase more to areas of the schedule which need adjustment, while the offer of the Employer allocates a considerable portion to the BA base, an area which is already better than all comparable districts, (by \$412 to the next district).

I conclude on the basis of the foregoing and the discussion below that unit employees are entitled to a general increase comparable to that of comparable employees at comparable districts. I conclude that the comparability factor favors the position of the Association.

Cost of Living

For the period July 1, 1985 to June 30, 1986, the National CPI-W changed 3.8%. The Employer has offered a total package increase of 8.36% and the Association of 9.39%. This factor favors the offer of the Employer.

Public Welfare

Ordinarily, the public interest is in maintaining comparable salaries and granting increases which are comparable, to that received by similar employees in comparable communities. This encourages the retention of capable teachers, encourages them in the performance of their work and attracts highly qualified teachers as needed. The Employer is correct in its position that the citizens of Montello School District are making a heavier tax effort than comparable districts. The following chart summarizes the situation in Montello:

District	<u>1984-5</u>			<u>1980</u>		<u>'84-5</u>
	cost/mem.	local sh (%)	EV/M	%pover.	med. inc.	levy rte.
Camb.	3,911.57	67.61	192,174.	8.78	17,821.	11.6
Fall R.	4,068.75	63.04	175,294.	10.63	19,469.	12.9

Gr., Lke.	4,725.90	94.14	388,669.	6.47	19,840.	10.89
Pard.	3,366.35	53.81	148,968.	7.12	18,260.	10.51
Poyn.	3,719.22	59.43	160,020.	8.47	20,539.	12.36
Prince.	3,767.71	84.81	277,738.	10.34	14,469.	11.76
Rand.	3,923.41	71.61	202,729.	6.64	19,511.	12.28
Rio	4,039.39	58.28	154,248.	9.66	18,253.	13.79
West.	3,437.16	77.97	225,189.	11.55	15,076.	10.57
AV. w/oM	3,884.38*	70.08**	213,892.***	8.85§	18,138.	11.85
Mont.	3,759.51	75.02	224,678.	12.81	14,375.	11.95

\* Without Green Lake, this figure is 3,779.20

\*\* Without Green Lake, this figure is 67.07%

\*\*\* Without Green Lake, this figure is \$192,045.

§ Without Green Lake, this figure is 9.15%

Thus, while Montello is an area in which the local taxpayers pay 75% of school costs, fourth highest in the area, Montello has the highest number of persons below the poverty line and the lowest median income of all comparable districts. Assuming families in Montello have the same average property value per family as families in comparable communities, Montello taxpayers do bear a heavier financial burden to support their schools than in comparable communities. This factor weighs heavily against granting greater than comparable or appropriate increases.

Certain factors limit the impact of the ability of the local taxpayers to bear the weight of a taxes necessary to pay the instant increase. Primarily, the state has allocated additional funds for the dual purpose of increasing teacher salaries and reducing property tax burden. Given the current strong financial situation of the school district, it is not necessary to give unit employees a less than comparable wage increase to achieve the dual purposes. Secondly, the allocation of wage increase has some importance in this case and is separately supported by the public interest in encouraging teachers to obtain MA degrees and retaining teachers who do.

### Conclusion

The parties have not argued with respect to the other issues and they are clearly outweighed in their entirety by the salary schedule issue. Based upon the foregoing the final offer of the Association is closer to appropriate in this case. Accordingly, the final offer of the Association is adopted.

### AWARD

That the final offer of the Association be, and the same hereby is, ordered incorporated into the parties' collective bargaining agreement.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 29th day of April, 1987.

  
Stanley H. Michelstetter II,  
Arbitrator



RECEIVED

MAY 05 1987

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

STANLEY H. MICHELSTETTER II

Attorney at Law

SUITE 204

5555 NORTH PORT WASHINGTON ROAD  
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN 53217

TELEPHONE (414) 963-8666

April 30, 1987

Mr. David R. Friedman  
Attorney at Law  
30 W. Mifflin St.  
Room 802  
Madison, WI 53703

Mr. Jermitt Krage  
South Central United Educators  
214 W. Cook St.  
P.O. Box 192  
Portage, WI 53901

Re: Montello School District and Montello Education Association,  
Case 13, No. 36554 Med/Arb-3835, my file No. 244

Dear Sirs:

Enclosed please find a copy of the appendicies which I inadvertently omitted. The Commission will find enclosed also a copy of my fee statement.

Very truly yours,

Stanley H. Michelstetter II

Enclosure

RECEIVED

date: April 29, 1987

MAY 05 1987

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

case: Montello School District and Montello Education Association,  
Case 13, No. 36554 Med/Arb-3835

my file no.: 244

fees:

docketing charge	\$50.00
1 day mediation @\$425/day	425.00
1 day hearing @\$425/day	425.00
2 days decision @\$425/day	850.00
Total fees	1,750.00

expensses:

meals	33.29
hotel	61.04
424 miles @ .25 /mi.	106.00
8 pages typing @\$3.50 /p.	28.00
50 pages copies @.10	5.00
Total expenses	233.33

TOTAL DUE 1,983.33

amount payable by union: 991.66  
amount payable by employer: 991.66

my social security number is 391-46-0278  
my employer I.D. no. is 39-1507156

RECEIVED

MAY 05 1987

REPORT AND FEE STATEMENT OF MEDIATOR-ARBITRATOR WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mediator-Arbitrator: Stan Michelstetter MED/ARB No. 11041

Employer: Montello Schools  
(Name) (Address)

Union: Montello Ed Ass'n  
(Name) (Address)

Date Order Appointing: None Single Arbitrator  Panel

Dates of Public Hearing Pursuant to Citizen Petition: None

Dates of Mediation By Mediator-Arbitrator: Dec 1 '86 Resolved in Mediation: Yes  No

Dates of Hearing: Dec 15, '86 City: Montello

Was Transcript Taken: Yes  No  Number of Pages: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Rec'd \_\_\_\_\_

Were Briefs Filed: Yes  No  If Yes, Date Last Brief Rec'd: 1/1/87

Date of Award: Apr 27 Employer's Final Offer Selected: \_\_\_\_\_

Union's Final Offer Selected: X

Fees:

No. of Days: 2 Hearing + 0 Travel x 425 Per Diem Rate = 850 Total

Preparation of Award: 2 Days x 425 Per Diem Rate = 850 Total

Expenses: 106 Transportation + 127.33 Other = 233.33 Total

1493.33  
Total Charges

Amount Payable by Employer 491.66

Amount Payable by Union 991.66

Date of this Report: Apr 29 1987

Signature: [Signature]

OPTIONAL INFORMATION  
E. D. N. # 84-1507156  
SOC. SEC. # 341-46-2227  
(For IRS Reporting Requirement)

PLEASE ATTACH COPY OF AWARD, IF ANY, TO THIS REPORT, AND MAIL TO WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION, P.O. BOX 7870, MADISON, WISCONSIN 53707-7870

1986-87 MONTELLO BOARD OF EDUCATION FINAL OFFER

Exhibit # 3

	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	BA+30	MA	MA+6	MA+12
0	17372	17622	17872	18122	18372	18622	18922	19222	19522
1	17872	18127	18382	18642	18902	19162	19472	19797	20122
2	18472	18732	18992	19262	19532	19802	20122	20472	20822
3	18972	19237	19502	19782	20062	20342	20672	21047	21422
4	19472	19742	20012	20302	20592	20882	21222	21622	22022
5	19972	20247	20522	20822	21122	21422	21772	22197	22622
6	20472	20752	21032	21342	21652	21962	22322	22772	23222
7	20872	21157	21442	21762	22082	22402	22772	23247	23722
8	21272	21562	21852	22182	22512	22842	23222	23722	24222
9	21672	21967	22262	22602	22942	23282	23672	24197	24722
0	21972	22272	22572	22922	23272	23622	24022	24572	25122
1	22272	22577	22882	23242	23602	23962	24372	24947	25522
2	22572	22882	23192	23562	23932	24302	24722	25322	25922
3	22872	23187	23502	23882	24262	24642	25072	25697	26322
4	23172	23492	23812	24202	24592	24982	25422	26072	26722
5	23472	23797	24122	24522	24922	25322	25772	26447	27122
6	23772	24102	24432	24842	25252	25662	26122	26822	27522
7	24072	24407	24742	25162	25582	26002	26472	27197	27922
8	24372	24712	25052	25482	25912	26342	26822	27572	28322
9	24672	25017	25362	25802	26242	26682	27172	27947	28722
0	24972	25322	25672	26122	26572	27022	27522	28322	29122
1	25272	25627	25982	26442	26902	27362	27872	28697	29522
2	25572	25932	26292	26762	27232	27702	28222	29072	29922
3	25872	26237	26602	27082	27562	28042	28572	29447	30322
4	26172	26542	26912	27402	27892	28382	28922	29822	30722
5	26472	26847	27222	27722	28222	28722	29272	30197	31122

This 1986-87 final offer salary schedule reflects the following changes from the 1985-86 salary schedule.

- 1.) \$1,160.00 has been added to the base.
- 2.) \$25.00 has been added to each of the lanes beginning at BA+6 and ending at MA+12.
- 3.) \$100.00 has been added to the increment between Step 1 and Step 2.
- 4.) \$100.00 has been added to the increment between Step 7 and Step 8.
- 5.) \$100.00 has been added to the increment between Step 8 and Step 9.

The Board has offered to include a provision on the extra-curricular salary schedule for two Varsity Club Advisors, both receiving the rate of:

Step	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	190	195	200	205	210	215	220

*Not complete  
 will not be offered  
 reviewed by me*

A. Salary Schedule

1985-86

	SA	SA+6	SA+12	SA+18	SA+24	SA+30	MA	MA+6	MA+12
0	16212	16437	16662	16887	17112	17337	17612	17867	18162
1	16712	16942	17172	17407	17642	17877	18162	18462	18762
2	17212	17447	17682	17927	18172	18417	18712	19037	19362
3	17712	17952	18192	18447	18702	18957	19262	19612	19962
4	18212	18457	18702	18967	19232	19497	19812	20187	20562
5	18712	18962	19212	19467	19722	20037	20362	20762	21162
6	19212	19467	19722	20007	20292	20577	20912	21337	21762
7	19612	19872	20132	20427	20722	21017	21362	21812	22262
8	19912	20177	20442	20747	21052	21357	21712	22187	22662
9	20212	20482	20752	21067	21382	21697	22062	22562	23062
10	20512	20787	21062	21387	21712	22037	22412	22937	23462
11	20812	21092	21372	21707	22042	22377	22762	23312	23862
12	21112	21397	21682	22027	22372	22717	23112	23687	24262
13	21412	21702	21992	22347	22702	23057	23462	24062	24662
14	21712	22007	22302	22667	23032	23397	23812	24437	25062
15	22012	22312	22612	22987	23362	23737	24162	24812	25462
16	22312	22617	22922	23307	23692	24077	24512	25187	25862
17	22612	22922	23232	23627	24022	24417	24862	25562	26262
18	22912	23227	23542	23947	24352	24757	25212	25937	26662
19	23212	23532	23852	24267	24682	25097	25562	26312	27062
20	23512	23837	24162	24587	25012	25437	25912	26687	27462
21	23812	24142	24472	24907	25342	25777	26262	27062	27862
22	24112	24447	24782	25227	25672	26117	26612	27437	28262
23	24412	24752	25092	25547	26002	26457	26962	27812	28662
24	24712	25057	25402	25867	26332	26797	27312	28187	29062
25	25012	25362	25712	26187	26662	27137	27662	28562	29462

1985-86 Step Placement

For those teachers who were on steps 0-15 of the 1984-85 salary schedule, their 1985-86 placement will be the 1984-85 placement plus the increment given under the 1984-85 contract.  
 Example: 1984-85 placement was step 4. The increment moves the teacher to a 1985-86 placement of step 5.

For those teachers who were on step 16 of the 1984-85 salary schedule, their 1985-86 placement will be step 16 plus any superadditions previously granted and any superadditions due under the 1984-85 contract for 1985-86.  
 Example: 1984-85 placement was step 16. 4 previous superadditions were granted plus 1 superaddition granted for 1985-86. The teacher's 1985-86 placement is step 21.

All placement assumes the teacher is placed in the appropriate column.

*Donald L. Dwork*  
 9-10-86  
*Alma J. Paul*  
 9-10-86